THEOLOGY

VOL. LIX FEBRUARY, 1956 No. 428

Editorial

MOST of England's ancient parishes and parish churches are generous quarries for the historian, but few could provide better materials for the construction of a book than St Margaret's, Westminster—the parish church of the House of Commons and the scene of many national as well as local occasions. Fewer still—in these days when church history is treated as the Cinderella of our theological academies—are the parochial incumbents who have the knowledge and ability to make a reliable and readable volume out of the records at their disposal or within their reach. St Margaret's, Westminster, enjoys at present the rare fortune of having as its rector an eminent ecclesiastical historian. It cannot be easy to write books in a position that must have so many obligations, and some of the credit for Canon Charles Smyth's *Church and Parish: Studies in Church Problems, illustrated from the Parochial History of St Margaret's, Westminster* (S.P.C.K., 17s. 6d.), should be given to the General Theological Seminary, New York. The authorities of that enlightened and flourishing foundation, by inviting Canon Smyth to deliver the Bishop Paddock Lectures, ensured that the fruits of his researches at St Margaret's would be harvested in a manner that would bring both pleasure and profit to the Church at large.

Church and Parish is not a straightforward or conventional parish history, though its readers will probably learn and remember more about the history of St Margaret's from this book than they would from any other. What Canon Smyth has done is to bring to light—and to life—a large variety of episodes that occurred at St Margaret's and of personalities that were connected with the parish, and then to allow himself to reflect upon ways in which they illustrate both the past history and permanent characteristics of the English Church and Nation. The range of topics on which he is led to discourse is sufficiently indicated by the titles of his six lectures, namely "Citizen and Churchman", "The Church under Persecution", "Religious Education", "New Wine and Old Bottles", "The Church and Liberalism", and "The Prodigality and Carefulness of God". We cannot say whether we are more enthusiastic about Canon Smyth's beautifully documented history or about the wisdom of the morals he draws from it. St Margaret's is of course a parish church with unique national associations but the things that have happened there, the people who have worshipped there, and the clergymen who have had the cure of souls there, have been for the most part typical not only of their contemporaries but of what goes on in all parishes

always. Even this delectable item from the churchwardens' accounts for 1610–11 has its modern counterparts: "Payd to goodwyfe Wells for salte to destroy the fleas in the Churchwardens pewe, and for makinge cleane of the same pewe . . . vj*d.*"

Despite such pleasant touches, this is a very serious book, altogether suitable for reading in Lent, unless you make it a rule not to *enjoy* your Lenten reading. We may all share the author's hope that "it may encourage others to investigate more thoroughly the rich material contained in our parochial records".[1]

The Revision of the Psalter

The Convocations' recent approval in principle of the appointment of a standing Liturgical Commission may, shortly, bring to the fore the question of psalter revision. Such revision has long been mooted but, in England, it has never reached fruition. The Rev. Harold Riley, who moved in the Canterbury Lower House, the resolution requesting the appointment of a liturgical commission, is himself the author of a proposal for reform. It has been published under the title, *The Revision of the Psalter, An Essay in Liturgical Reform* (S.P.C.K. 1948). His introduction gives a summary account of the previous attempts to produce a practical revised psalter. Now we have also the *Broadcast Psalter*, and the psalters in *A Prayer Book for 1949*, the work of Preb. Oscar Hardman, and in *A Proposed Prayer Book*, issued by the Episcopal Synod of the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon (S.P.C.K., Madras, 1952).

Mr Riley's book has two principal features—(*a*) the text of his revision of the Prayer Book Version and (*b*) the substitution of a new order for the liturgical recitation of the psalms instead of the traditional monthly course. This second proposal, deeply interesting as it is, is not the concern of this article. Our concern is with the text which should commend itself for adoption in a revised psalter, and with its presentation in a form prepared for liturgical use.

Each of the revisions mentioned is conservative. They cling as close as they can to Coverdale's text while removing mistranslations, archaisms, difficulties for chanting, or whatever else are the particular objectives of each. Their order of closeness to the P.B.V. is *India, Riley, Broadcast,* and *Hardman.* The *Broadcast Psalter* has been pointed for Anglican chanting and contains a selection only of the psalms. The others are complete but only pointed for recitation.

The Archbishops' Committee which produced in 1951 the report

[1] We have noticed only two slips. On p. 33 the author speaks of himself "as a priest of the only Established Church in all the Anglican Communion"; when he said that, the Church in the diocese of Barbados cannot have been in his mind. On p. 256 he refers to "the Very Rev. Dr A. V. Baillie, late Dean of Windsor". After his retirement from the deanery Dr Baillie was very particular that he should be addressed as "the Rev." and not "the Very Rev.", and rightly so. At Windsor, and we should suppose also at Westminster, there is happily no one to disperse "emeritus" titles.

Music in Church also advocates conservative revision. One solitary paragraph (page 34) conveys a picture of brief consideration and no enthusiasm.

> "It should be recognized that the unintelligibility of certain passages in the Psalms constitutes a great hindrance to the use of the Psalms by the people. If the Psalter is to take again its proper place in the worship of the Church of England, it is essential that a more determined effort than has yet been made should result in a conservative revision of the Psalms for use in church, which would correct the more obvious obscurities."

Diagnosis and prognosis how true! Treatment how timid! If the Committee's words were seriously meant, why was there no recommendation saying how to attain the next step?

Harold Riley reckons that he has made some two thousand changes from the P.B.V. text. His aim has been to retain the beauty of Coverdale's translation and to achieve an accuracy equal to that of the R.V., substantial, but not literal accuracy. It cannot have been an easy task. The practice of invisible repair of torn garments requires much tedious work in the handling of individual threads and the weighing of detail so that the old and the new threads match in colour and in weave. In the introduction to *The Revision of the Psalter* four examples are offered to show how the rhythms and phraseology of the Prayer Book may be used as far as possible. Four versions are there set out for comparison: P.B.V., R.V., Oesterley (S.P.C.K., 1939), and the author's suggested version. In setting down the same verses for comment here, let us replace Dr W. O. E. Oesterley's translation with that of the *Revised Standard* Version which was published in 1952.

Psalm 13. 4

P.B.V. Lest mine enemy say, I have prevailed against him: for if I be cast down, they that trouble me will rejoice at it.

R.V. Lest mine enemy say, I have prevailed against him;
Lest mine adversaries rejoice when I am moved.

R.S.V. Lest my enemy say, "I have prevailed over him";
lest my foes rejoice because I am shaken.

Riley Lest mine enemy say, I have prevailed against him: * lest when I be moved, they that trouble me rejoice at it.

Comment

when I be moved. The change of *if* to *when* requires the indicative mood, in which *be* is only used in the plural (Shorter Ox. Dict.). Read *when I am moved* as in R.V.

at it. Omit as unnecessary. Rhythmically there is no longer need to contrast the heavy double stress of *cast down* with a light ending to the verse as in P.B.V.

Psalm 14. 8 (v. 4 or 5 in other versions) (in his example Riley quotes the first hemistich only)

P.B.V. Have they no knowledge, that they are all such workers of mischief: eating up my people as it were bread, and call not upon the Lord?

R.V. Have all the workers of iniquity no knowledge?
Who eat up my people as they eat bread,
And call not upon the Lord.

R.S.V. Have they no knowledge, all the evildoers
who eat up my people as they eat bread,
and do not call upon the Lord?

Riley Have they no knowledge, they that are such workers of mischief: * eating up my people as it were bread, and calling not upon the Lord?

Comment

they that are. If Coverdale had understood the Hebrew in the sense taken by the revisers would he not have used English as direct as that in the R.V.? It is true that, as said elsewhere in the introduction, there are many small changes which for the sake of accuracy can be made without any detriment, e.g. *peoples* for *people*; but not here. This interchange of *they* and *that* irritates, because the remaining words lie in their original place, but with a twist. The natural way of expressing the new understanding of the Hebrew is not set down.

calling not upon. The order of the verb and the negative agrees with the P.B.V. However, it would be better to read *not calling upon the Lord.* The rhythm is then nearer P.B.V. with corresponding double stresses *call not—not call.*

Psalm 17. 13, 14

P.B.V. Up, Lord, disappoint him, and cast him down: deliver my soul from the ungodly, which is a sword of thine;
From the men of thy hand, O Lord, from the men, I say, and from the evil world: which have their portion in this life, whose bellies thou fillest with thy hid treasure.

R.V. Arise, O Lord,
Confront him, cast him down:
Deliver my soul from the wicked by thy sword;
From men, by thy hand, O Lord,
From men of the world, whose portion is in this life,
And whose belly thou fillest with thy treasure:

R.S.V. Arise, O Lord! confront them, overthrow them!
Deliver my life from the wicked by thy sword,
from men by thy hand, O Lord,
from men whose portion in life is of the world.
May their belly be filled with what thou hast stored up for them.

Riley Up, Lord, confront him, and cast him down; * deliver my soul from the ungodly by thy sword;
By thy hand, O Lord, deliver me from men, even from men of the world, * who have their portion in this life, whose belly thou fillest with thy hid treasure.

Comment

even. A necessary insertion in this version. It may be misunderstood. Is it equivalent to *id est,* "men, that is, men of the world"; or does it indicate the extreme among the class, "from men, even from [my *bêtes noires*] men of the world"? R.S.V. places the last line in the following verse.

Up, Lord. This stays as an archaism; to the modern ear it can sound brusque, and thus irreverent.

Psalm 141. 5, 6

P.B.V. Let the righteous rather smite me friendly: and reprove me.

But let not their precious balms break my head: yea, I will pray yet against their wickedness.

R.V. Let the righteous smite me, it shall be a kindness;
And let him reprove me, it shall be as oil upon my head;
Let not my head refuse it:
For even in their wickedness shall my prayer continue.

R.S.V. Let a good man strike or rebuke me in kindness,
but let the oil of the wicked never anoint my head;
for my prayer is continually against their wicked deeds.

Riley Let the righteous smite me in kindness, and reprove me: * but let not the oil of the wicked anoint my head; yea, I will pray yet against their wickedness.

Comment

Neither in *Riley* nor in P.B.V. does the last clause link clearly with what precedes.

To the mind of one reader each of the author's self-chosen illustrations has shown opportunity of still further improvement; if his work is on the right lines it must be subjected to further revision.

Before leaving these particular verses, since the R.V. and the R.S.V. have been brought close together, we can note the great improvement in rhythm achieved in the latter over that of the version made seventy years ago. It is also simple and direct. It has benefited from the freedom to use other than Elizabethan English. The rules which have been applied in translating the psalms have been applied in all the poetic portions of the O.T., and, largely, in the prose sections as well. The version is becoming increasingly known in England. It was published after the psalter revisions mentioned had been made, and after the Report of the Archbishops' Committee. In spite of the unanimity of these in seeking a conservative revision, and with one's own love of Coverdale's version in mind, one is persuaded that that way is neither a good following of precedent nor does it do justice to present needs. The existence of the R.S.V. and the anticipated issue in the next ten years of a New English Translation, each sponsored by a very wide range of Christian Communions, makes possible a more satisfying course.

When the English service was first used both psalms and lessons were taken from the same version, the Great Bible of 1541. It is probable that in considerable, but diminishing, degree this remained true from 1549 to 1611 and beyond. Lectern Bibles have long lives. Even where the Geneva version, or the Bishops' Bible, was introduced the origin of the psalter retained for use in the Common Prayer would be remembered. As there were no fixed days for taking either these versions or the A.V. into use, the change from the Great Bible, when delayed until the replacement of a worn copy became imperative, could have covered three generations. (In passing we may note that the second edition of the Bishops' Bible (1572) contained the psalms in two versions, printed in parallel columns: *The translation according to the Ebrewe*, and *The translation used in common prayer*. The folio edition of the Geneva version (1578) followed suit.)

To use the same version in both psalms and lessons is natural, for the psalms are Scripture. They are recited liturgically and in course for that very reason. If they were just religious poems, they and Dr J. M. Neale's translations from the Greek and Latin Hymnographers could stand side by side; or we could be satisfied with paraphrases in metre. When the Convocations in 1661 approved the continued use of the older but traditional translation of the psalter, they maintained its first status which, previously restored under the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity, it otherwise would have lost to a psalter in the A.V.[1] Liturgical history will show other examples of old versions retaining a place. Thus in the Roman use the old Italic version is used in the Proper of the Mass; but the Vulgate is used in the Breviary. The Roman Church has answered the need for a new translation. The *Psalterium Breviarii Romani* issued by the present Pope in 1945 is authorized for permissive use. It is a new translation which takes into account the *textus primigenii*, and the Vulgate and other ancient renderings *quantum fieri possit*, and is intended to enable persons who recite the Divine Office to see clearly *quid Spiritus Sanctus per os Psalmistae significare voluerit*. This new translation of the psalter is the work of the Pontifical Commission which is revising the whole Bible.

The course proposed by the Archbishops' Committee (fifty years ago it was advocated by the great Dr S. R. Driver) involves asking the Convocations to approve a special revision of the psalms made on principles different from those adopted for the rest of the Bible. Deliberately to set out to have different standards of translation appears unseemly in itself. Then, if that course is set, the doors are opened to argument about what that standard is to be and, not unlikely, to detailed criticism of the result. The product, even with Convocation's approval, would not have so welcome a status as that of a version which, being good for chanting and recitation, also lay on the lectern of the church. The product, unless the changes were so few as scarcely to be called a revision, would be a specimen of unique language. English? Not Coverdale's because the tie is to his letter, not his spirit; not contemporary; not even biblical, but merely psalteric. The product would stand in literature solitary, like the pillar of salt which once was Lot's wife. Her past was so seductive, and her head turned back. The proposal is an aberration of mind consequent upon the rhythmical deficiency of the R.V. Surely, if the P.B.V. psalms are to be replaced, whether entirely or by a permitted alternative, it ought to be by a version in the series Great Bible, A.V., R.V., R.S.V., N.E.T. These versions have, or may be expected to have, a standing which other versions lack.

Psalter revisions touch Anglican unity. It seems as though the

[1] When Archbishop Parker wrote to Sir William Cecil (5 October 1568) sending a copy of the Bishops' Bible for the Queen he seems to have pictured a voluntary use of the psalter in this version in place of the old psalter of the Great Bible. "The Psalters might remain in Queres as they be much multiplied, but [i.e. except] wher of ther owne accord they wold vse this Translacion."—Pollard, *Records of the English Bible*, p. 293.

Irish, American, and Indian versions of the English psalter will take different forms. There is everything to be said for the Indian Church being completely responsible for a Tamil psalter, and for the Province of South Africa having a psalter in Afrikaans. Much also, on the other hand, is to be said for the Anglican Communion coming to an agreement upon a common alternative to the inherited P.B.V.; upon a version to be used whenever the service is in English and the old version is not desired. Such a version could be one more mark of free agreement, and of union, between the branches of the Anglican Communion.

Not all the past revisions of the Bible have gone the full course of revision which is required if a version is to be used liturgically. For a full revision the Church needs (*a*) not just an accurate translation: a student's Bible, but also (*b*) a translation good to the ear when read in public; (*c*) it will include the Apocrypha; (*d*) as the pslams are used for recitation, full revision here will include an appropriate division into stanza, verse and hemistich. A psalter without these is liturgically stillborn. The Church needs a liturgical Bible.

So far, in America, the Revised Standard Version has reached stage (*b*). Canon 20 of the Protestant Episcopal Church has been amended to include the R.S.V. among the versions authorized for use in the reading of the lessons. It is unlikely that any further stage will be accomplished unless Anglicans take action themselves as regards the Apocrypha and the Psalms.

A brief look at the psalms in the R.S.V. will show that, for convenience of reference, the numbering of the verses has not been altered. It can be seen too that some psalms (e.g. Ps. 2. 11, 12; Ps. 45. 10 f.) clearly need a re-division of verses for liturgical use. More examples will appear upon comparison with the P.B.V., and as the work of division into hemistiches proceeds. Doubtful points of division need testing against the chant. As the division into parts is more marked in plainchant, that test is usually more sure than a test against an Anglican chant.

The new translation now in progress in England will require similar consideration if it is to attain to full use in the Church. Need all work on a liturgical version of the psalms in that translation wait until the whole of the O.T. is published? There are so many stages before a new translation of that magnitude and importance can reach publication that years of time could be saved if some person or group, within or without the translating committee, were allowed to work at a liturgical edition of the psalter. Conditions of work could reasonably be made so that neither was the principal matter prejudiced, nor the Church's future judgment on the suitability of the psalter fettered. As the edition would be used chiefly within the Anglican Communion, the project at an early stage should come under the cognizance of the Liturgical Commission. In the days of high publishing costs it is difficult for individuals, whether editors or publishers, to proceed unless there is some sort of backing. But no real valuation can be made of either an R.S.V. or an N.E.T. psalter before an experimental version has been printed.

The use in adjacent parishes of A.V. and R.V. has been no cause of theological argument. Alternative versions of the psalter could be as easily used within the Church. Human likes are slow to change, and it is to be expected that alternative versions would continue in use for a long period. Tate and Brady's New Version of the Psalms in Metre did not immediately oust the Old Version of Sternhold and Hopkins. A visitor to Peterborough Cathedral can to-day find both versions and the Prayer Book bound in one volume on the desks of the Canons' Stalls. The sentence at the end of the preface to *Hymns Ancient and Modern Revised* 1950 will describe what is necessary. "The old or Standard edition will continue to be printed so long as the demand for it continues."

The real quality of a revised version may easily be overlooked if the comparison with its predecessor is made only verse by verse. Such a course may mean that the overall consistency of the new with itself may pass unnoticed. Very few of us could appreciate fairly a painting when the comparison with another was made square inch by square inch across the canvas. The picture, and the psalm must be seen as a whole. Psalm 93 may be taken as an example. The first verse in P.B.V. has the well-known words "glorious apparel". They are not in R.S.V. By long association, by our memory of what an effective choir would make of them, we might be led to think little of a version which omitted such words. But "majesty" is also a word of grandeur. We find that the picture given by the psalm as a whole in the R.S.V. is clear, simple and effective.

(The hemistiches have been marked. The original marking of verse 2 has been placed in brackets.)

Psalm 93

1. The Lord reigns; he is robed in majesty; *
   the Lord is robed, he is girded with strength.
2. Yea, the world is established; it shall never be moved; *
   (2) thy throne is established from of old;
   thou art from everlasting.
3. The floods have lifted up, O Lord,
   the floods have lifted up their voice, *
   the floods lift up their roaring.
4. Mightier than the thunders of many waters,
   mightier than the waves of the sea, *
   the Lord on high is mighty!
5. Thy decrees are very sure; *
   holiness befits thy house,
   O Lord, for evermore.

If those words have not yet been set up near the Horseshoe Falls of Niagara, they might well be.

This psalm also illustrates another point. The R.S.V. style is to omit some conjunctions and extra words which appear in the P.B.V. and have helped to give it a smoothness of rendering. Here it may be claimed rightly that the staccato in the opening stanza is an effective part of the whole. Elsewhere, because of this economy of words, some short lines have been made shorter still. It is a difficulty more easily faced in pointing for plainsong than for Anglican chant. Though words could be added without vitally affecting the sense,

probably it is better to let the new version speak in its own way. After the first adjustments, when the change of R.S.V. has been made, we shall find that the losses are far less than we first feared, and that the gains are considerable.

It will often be right that any formal proposals put forward by a Liturgical Commission for experimental use should first have been tried out on a small scale, or in some sphere in which legal considerations do not arise. So we may remember that a revised psalter, besides its use in private, may find a preliminary niche by trial in schools, in the informal services of church organizations, and as the source of the Introit psalm at the Eucharist. Its adoption for some of these purposes may lead to an appreciative use of the old version, as well as to a means of instruction in the rules of church chant—perhaps to much more.

HUGH CASSON.

Churches To-day: a Problem of Communication[1]

THE Christian Church exists to teach the Christian Faith and the truths which it contains. That Faith cannot alter; its contents must remain unchanged. They do not differ from one century to another, or vary from society to society. But though Christian Truth cannot alter and must remain the same for every age, it has to be interpreted afresh to each age in the language and idiom in which each age expresses itself, and may be seen in different lights and in different angles. One can see this process at work again and again in connexion with various parts of Christian Doctrine. The *fact* of the Atonement, for example, remains unaltered in every century, but it is seen from different angles and interpreted differently by theologians in the light of the prevailing interests or pressures of their times. The relevance of the Church and of Christian teaching has continually to be brought out afresh. The most obvious means by which this has been brought out is that of the sermon, and we could wish that our preaching were more contemporary than it sometimes is: there is too great a gulf between the outlook and ideas of the clergy, and indeed of the average practising Christian layman, and those of the physical sciences, the medicine, the technology and the mechanisms of our time, the contexts familiar to the majority of our contemporaries in their daily lives.

But though the sermon may be traditionally the obvious way of interpreting the Christian Faith it is by no means nowadays, delivered as it normally is in the setting of Christian worship, the way which most people will come across, for relatively few regularly take part in that worship or are familiar with its setting. Hence the value and the greatness of the opportunity presented by radio and television, an opportunity which should be grasped courageously and imaginatively, but also with wisdom and discretion. As the Medieval Church, which gave birth to the Order of Preachers, saw in another

[1] The substance of a paper read at the Festival of the Friends of St David's Cathedral, August 1955.

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC LIBRARY

context, this is not an opportunity for every clergyman or for every parish church. The Church should be most careful to use, for radio and television preaching, only those who have shown the special qualities necessary for success in the use of these media: only those should be put forward who have shown themselves qualified to be, *in these particular ways,* "able ministers of the New Testament".

But if large numbers of our fellow-countrymen seldom come to church to hear sermons it is certain that large numbers of them do come to see our churches, and from time to time attend them for such occasions as weddings and funerals. If they are old and venerable these buildings have much to tell of the age and strength of the Church—the anvil that has worn out so many hammers. But in too many of them there is a real danger that the strong message that they have to give is obscured or even ruined by the decoration, the ornaments, the pictures, the music and the glass to be found in them. Ordered from some church furnisher's shop and supplied often without reference to or sight of the particular building whose significance they are supposed to bring out, they serve to make an ancient church not the stronghold of a revolutionary and contemporary Faith, but a museum of paintings, carving, statuary and so forth, purporting to illustrate truths whose relevance they in fact conceal; where the saints—men and women virile, strong and courageous—are reduced to the semblance of ghosts and the very figure of the Saviour himself is lost to men's sight in a cloud of sentimentality and weak tradition, or hidden behind a veil of quiet and correct good taste. What an opportunity is lost, for example, when, faced with the problem of putting a new altar and reredos in some great church, we content ourselves with a careful reproduction (or attempted reproduction, for its essential spirit escapes us) of some 15th-century original. In the 14th or 15th century such work was contemporary, and spoke to its age as such: to attempt to reproduce it to-day is to attempt the impossible. It is often said that "new work in such a church as this must be in keeping with the rest of it", and this is taken to mean that everything must have a Gothic look, whereas in fact our ancient churches gain their vitality because for centuries what was put in them was contemporary, a living part of a living whole, which good 20th-century work would be in an old church to-day. Instead of which we have altars and reredoses and ornaments which are mere copies of the past, and quite dead. How the thing works may be seen in St David's Cathedral where the rich, almost Moorish, wooden ceiling of the nave fits in beautifully with the severe and weighty, quite different stonework of four centuries before it; or in Île Tudy in Brittany where a 17th-century exterior forms a charming outer shell for a Romanesque interior. And I hope it will be seen too in a striking way in Llandaff Cathedral, the first cathedral to be restored free from the influence of the Gothic Revival, where we shall see, if all goes well, carefully restored medieval work with an arch of 20th-century material and construction flung across a 13th-century nave, crowned with a great statue by Sir Jacob Epstein, all giving a sense of power and vitality.

There are problems, too, about the building of new churches. What is the significance or the sense of erecting in the 20th century churches in the Gothic manner? Large, costly, draughty, difficult to see or hear in, frightfully expensive and almost impossible to heat, they strike once again the museum note, emphasizing 20th-century man's feeling of the irrelevance of the Church, of Christianity itself, to his situation. It is true that churches like this were built in the 19th century and that they were sometimes very good, even great, churches when they were built by great architects like Pearson or Bodley or Street, who were far from being mere copyists and stamped their own style on the churches they made. Moreover, at a time when even railway stations, prisons and law courts were being built in the Gothic manner these churches did seem to speak to many in their day and to interpret Christianity aright. But it is important to remember that even then the vast majority of the industrial population was out of touch with the Church, which seemed to have nothing to say to their condition; while to-day the Gothic church and Gothic ornament are an anachronism. That this is so is surely made clear by the dying out of architects capable of understanding and creating a Gothic building and the disappearance of the craftsman who can carve Gothic decorative detail and ornament in a living way: I doubt if such a craftsman exists in Britain.

How then to design our new churches? We have passed through a century and a half of change in the material environment and opportunities of man, unparalleled in human history. Before fully understanding all the implications of steam power and the internal combustion engine we find ourselves in the age of atomic power. Religious, aesthetic and cultural indigestion has naturally followed and accounts, amongst other things, for the present state of architecture, secular as well as ecclesiastical, though the latter suffers more than the former, for the strictly functional requirements of secular buildings are sometimes the salvation of their designers. Ecclesiastical architects of to-day will on the whole do well to play for safety and fall back on what has been called "Stripped Gothic"—i.e. buildings recognizable from their general plan and outline as churches, in which, however, the traditional decorative motifs and ornaments are dispensed with. These are not, however, *modern* churches in the real sense of the word; they are in their way, perhaps, *transitional*. I suspect that this is the adjective which may be most truly applied to the much discussed Coventry Cathedral. I speak as a layman, but I do not think it can be called a really *modern* building and I find myself perturbed by the way in which in several church designs which I have seen an emanation from Coventry has troubled the architects. If such are to be troubled at all then they would be more profitably troubled by emanations from Paris and the Church of Notre Dame du Raincy which I saw in the late 'thirties, not long completed, a building of concrete and glass, a truly contemporary modern church. I have also been privileged to see lately some photographs of a completely modern building in which modern materials have been used in a manner natural to themselves in form and design. It is the new

chapel for the University of Ibadan in Nigeria, the work of Mr George Gaze Pace. The same architect is likely to be commissioned to build the chapel for one of our new universities, and it may well be that we shall have here a modern church building of the first order and significance. Of a new church by Le Corbusier at Ronchampe I have only seen two or three photographs and it is impossible to judge; one at least of the photographs, however, suggests that in building a church even this great architect has not altogether escaped one of the snares of 20th-century church builders, and has become quaint or even freakish.

When we pass from architects to individual artists the situation is more promising. Here Coventry Cathedral has done much good, and so have several churches (notably in the diocese of Chichester, as well as St Matthew's, Northampton). There is need for caution, however, for works of art in a church must enhance the significance and meaning of the building as a whole; placed in a church simply as isolated objets d'art they reduce it to the level of an art exhibition. Hence the importance, whether in building a new church or furnishing an old one, of employing a first-rate architect who will see the building as a whole, and the place and related significance of everything in it whether new or old. When I was Dean of Llandaff I was fortunate enough to secure for the cathedral, which was and still is in process of restoration, a considerable variety of furnishings, from a great pair of Italian gilded candlesticks to small roundels of stained glass and a small medieval carving of the Death of the Virgin. But none was bought until the architect was able to see how it could play its part in the building as he saw it fully restored. Of course there will be trouble: specialized artists can naturally think only of their special work and are not always ready to see it modified or altered to fall in with a general plan (last century the Dean and Chapter of Llandaff had considerable trouble with D. G. Rossetti over the altar piece he had designed for them). On the other hand, architects in their anxiety to further their grand plan are apt to insist on designing everything themselves, without always being as good at designing stalls or candlesticks, for example, as they are at designing a whole building, and without always understanding as the actual craftsman does the special qualities of the particular material to be used. This is where the client sometimes comes into his own; he may have to act as a kind of arbitrator and to settle the complications that arise.

So great has been the gulf between the Church and creative artists that a special problem often arises; it confronted the nuns who commissioned Sir Jacob Epstein to make for them a Madonna and Child in Cavendish Square, and it confronted the Dean and Chapter who commissioned the same great artist to make a figure of Christ in Majesty for Llandaff Cathedral. How can an artist who is not a Christian design works of art for Christian churches, derived from Christian themes? We have to remember that all art and all beauty and all truth came from God: "Thine incorruptible Spirit is in all things." As Mr John Bunting has written in a recent number of

Liturgical Art: "All sculptors who work honestly at their work with a single aim receive their inspiration from a single source; they may not hold the whole Christian truth but they do hold part of it with conviction; this lends power and meaning to their work and of this the Christian Church can rightly make use." "Christ risen supernatural, a portent for all time. . . . The Jew—the Galilean—condemns our wars, and warns us that 'Shalom, Shalom' must still be the watchword between man and man" (Epstein: *An Autobiography*, pp. 101 and 102; Hulton Press, 1955). In such words Sir Jacob Epstein writes of his first statue of Christ, an apt illustration of Mr Bunting's remarks. We may not always *like* the work of these modern artists or think them beautiful: but would we have *liked* the Crucifixion or felt it beautiful? At least through great artists Truth challenges us; at least their works are more likely to make us think about our Faith than do the insipidities which mar many of our churches and are to no small degree responsible for the lack of vitality in so much modern presentation of Christianity. Yet it is our churches and what we put in them that still provide us with our most readily available opportunities for confronting the average man with Christianity's challenge. The opportunities are there: whether we will make use of them is another matter.

†Glyn Swansea and Brecon.

Christianizing the Nation and Edifying the Church

Long before Lytton Strachey got to work on him, Thomas Arnold was the recipient of unflattering attention. Sometimes this took the form of faint praise for him as a headmaster, coupled with an affable refusal to consider that he had any other claim to serious attention. Sometimes it was outright opposition. In 1844, two years after Arnold's death, on the occasion of the publication of *Stanley's Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold*, J. B. Mozley exercised a little condescension on the subject. As a headmaster, he said, Arnold was great since "he had only to teach others, not to receive himself . . . a school of boys is a great receptacle of ideas, not a counter stream", but "his church reform pamphlet was a leap into a sphere for which he was unfit; and it let out a secret, which the world might not have discovered else; viz., that he was not a great man".[1] A study of Arnold, however, suggests that this judgment was more facile than accurate. Much that Arnold had to say about the State and the Church needed saying at the time and is worth considering now. Yet, although there has recently been a revival of interest in Arnold, in common with the resuscitation of other great Victorians, his views on these matters have been hardly touched upon. Where they have been mentioned they are classified simply as Broad Church: a convenient label which allows the reader to assume Arnold

[1] Mozley's *Essays Historical and Theological* (1878), II, 24.

believed anything or nothing.[1] This essay is an attempt to outline some of his ideas about the nature and purpose of the Church and the State.

The assumptions made about Arnold's views on these subjects are responsible for much of the criticism he has received. When Arnold spoke of the State and gave it an important place in his understanding of the divine scheme of things, it was assumed by some that he viewed that institution in the same way as Locke or Warburton. Similarly when Arnold attacked the leaders of the Oxford Movement, it was supposed that he was a low churchman. Both assumptions are wrong. Arnold held a high doctrine of the State and a high doctrine of the Church. Both views he maintained were scriptural and necessary. In order to understand Arnold's views on the nature and purpose of civil society it is best to consider them in relation to the idea he is most concerned to deny. This is the view "that the object of political society is the preservation of body and goods".[2] To make this the whole end and purpose of the State seemed to Arnold deplorable. He could not believe that such a limited and utilitarian conception of the place and purpose of civil society was correct. The end for which States existed was moral. The State was concerned with the highest good of the citizens who comprised it, not merely with their goods and chattels—or even the protection of their lives. It was true that Warburton had acknowledged that the State was concerned with morality, but as a means to its main end of conserving life and property. This expediency simply made matters worse! Arnold attacked it vigorously:

> "So then," he writes, "the State may and ought to employ the services of philosophy and religion; but it must do so only to prostitute them both: it must uphold the essential difference of moral good and evil so far as it is morally evil to assault our neighbour's person, or to rob him of his property and morally good to abstain from doing so. It must teach that God is and that He is a rewarder of them who diligently seek Him, only to show its people that they cannot with impunity sware a false oath on trial or at the custom house.[3]

In maintaining the essential moral character of government Arnold merely followed a long line of thinkers, and immediately, Hooker and Burke. He understood and accepted Hooker's theory of the State which Gladstone praised as "the great doctrine that the State is a person, having a conscience cognisant of matter of religion, and bound by all constitutional and natural means to advance it."[4] At

[1] A recent book on Arnold, N. Wymer's *Dr Arnold of Rugby* (1953), provides a convenient example; the author is not in the main, concerned with Arnold's theological opinions. When he does touch upon them, however, this is how they are described (p. 162): "Arnold ever critical of their creeds but tolerant of their rights, felt no personal affinity to High Church, Low Church or Evangelical. Each was too narrow in outlook for his liking. He required something broader."

[2] Ascribed by Arnold to Warburton, *Lectures in Modern History* (1849), Appendix, p. 35.

[3] *Fragment on the Church* (1845), Appendix II, p. 40.

[4] W. E. Gladstone, *The State in its Relations with the Church* (1838), p. 9.

the same time Arnold knew well the fear of coercion in matters of belief which such a view would arouse. Because of this he could understand why Macaulay rejected the theories about civil society that Gladstone advocated and preferred the views of Warburton. He was, therefore, careful to point out that to believe in the moral end of civil society did not necessarily mean that it was the function of the State to propagate religious truth, in the sense of proclaiming dogma. Arnold did not envisage this; he is everywhere more interested in the behaviour of men than in their intellectual professions of belief. The State, he thought, ought to require a profession of obedience rather than belief. A dissenter was not so much one who disbelieved what was taught by the Church as he who "wilfully withdrew himself from its society" and "Intellectual objections to Christianity should be tolerated where they are combined with moral obedience".[1] The function of the Christian State was not to produce strict creeds but to build up "vigorous Christian institutions".[2] This question of the rights of minorities and the place of dissenters from an established Church was, of course, a topical subject at the time when Arnold was writing. Much of the discussion, he thought, started on the wrong foot when it was dominated by thinking in terms of the political rights of individuals. Arnold tried to avoid making a dichotomy between these and the claims of society: "Individuals, in a political sense, are necessarily members as distinct from the body, they are nothing against Society."[3] This strong statement reflects the fear which Arnold shared with Burke that if Society were made to depend on individual wills "it would crumble into the dust and powder of individuality".

Even so it would be objected that since men differed about the content of Christian truth the State could be called Christian only in a very general sense, containing, as it would, men of various opinions. In such a Church and State, therefore, the Christian religion would be very much watered down and reduced to the lowest common denominator of belief. Arnold would not admit this objection:

> "Is it not most humiliating that any circumstances should ever have given the slightest colour to the assertion that the term Christian must be vague and of little value unless some sectarian peculiarities be added to complete the definition? that to be of Christ is nothing, unless we further declare whether we are of Paul or Apollos or Cephas? . . . I call a state Christian when it declares its belief in the divine origin and supreme authority of the Christian revelation as contained in the Scriptures."[4]

But even if these difficulties were overcome there still remained the objection that the State must be essentially different from the Church and could never be identified with it. Arnold considered that this difficulty was caused precisely because men had come to think of both Church and State in the wrong way. Because, in fact, they looked upon the State merely as a conserver of life and goods and the Church merely as pietistic. But if it were true that the object of the State was the happiness of Society and the good life of its members,

[1] *Lectures*, pp. 47 f. [2] Ibid., p. 48. [3] *Fragment*, p. 53. [4] Ibid.

and if the Church possessed the truth of how this might be achieved, then it could be said that the State possessed the power and the Church the knowledge, so that "the State having become enlightened by the knowledge of the Church becomes a society seeking the same end which the Church sought and with the same knowledge but with more extensive means of attaining it, because its inherent sovereignty gives it a greater power over outward things".[1] Such views were bound to provoke opposition. It is this, which he calls his "German Religionism", that led Mozley to accuse Arnold of subordinating the Church to the State and destroying her doctrines and corporate character. Perhaps again this criticism misses the very point under discussion; i.e. Arnold's conception of the Christian Nation. Here is a human society, looked at from one side it is a Church, viewed from another it is a nation. In this opinion Arnold merely followed Hooker and accepted a view as old as the assertion that the Emperor although ruler is also in the Church.

As for the Established Church in such a nation it could no more limit its obligations to a few spiritual matters than the State could reduce its proper functions to a mere concern with the preservation of life and goods. The union of Church and State at once brought the Gospel into touch with political institutions:

> "under other circumstances the Christian minister may perhaps be allowed to confine himself to the care of the poor and the ignorant: but the clergy of a national Church are directly called upon to Christianize the nation: not only to inculcate the private virtues of the Gospel but its pure and holy principles in their full extent; those divine laws of which it may indeed be said that their voice is the harmony of the world".[2]

Long before it became fashionable to advocate or denigrate the "Social Gospel" Arnold was trying to make clear that the Church, by definition, must be concerned with the whole of life. At Oxford, lecturing on the meaning of the word "church", he maintained that "We cannot attach any sense to it without conceiving of it as related to God and involving also the relations of men one to another", because of this "all church questions may be said to be both religious and political".[3] Ten years earlier, in a series of letters to the *Sheffield Courant* on the condition of the working classes, he had suggested some of the ways in which the Church might be better fitted to fulfil its function in modern society. It was utterly false to believe that the Church was an institution solely concerned with the "religious" side of man and to limit the reason for its existence to "provision for the religious instruction of a people by public teaching and ceremonies". All too often this had been the practice of the Church of England and, to her shame, it had been left to Quakers and other dissenters to work for social reforms. Arnold was very conscious of many of the social evils of his day but pessimistic about the possibilities of the clergy being stirred to do much about them.

> "I almost despair," he said, "of anything that any private or local efforts can do. I think that the clergy as a body might do much, if they were steadily to observe the evils of the times and preach fearlessly against

[1] *Fragment*, pp. 58 f. [2] Ibid. [3] *Lectures*, p. 217.

them. I cannot understand what is the good of a national Church if it be not to Christianize the Nation, and introduce the principles of Christianity into men's social and civil relations, and expose the wickedness of that spirit which maintains the game laws, and in agriculture and trade seems to think that there is no such sin as covetousness, and that if a man is not dishonest he has nothing to do but to make all the profit of his capital that he can."[1]

Arnold did not, however, think that there could be any great improvement in the witness of the Church in the world unless Christians understood more of what membership of Christ's Body involved. All depended on seeing the Church as "the Society of Christians", as "a living society not an inert mass of mere hearers and subjects".[2] The language both of Prophecy and St Paul, he considered, made it clear that the Gospel was not merely concerned with individual salvation but with a general restoration of all things. So far, both the geographical spread of Christianity and its moral effects had been partial, but if it were true that the Gospel spoke of a full redemption then we could never rest content with either of these limitations. It was the task of the Church both to spread Christianity and to preserve it. This it did by bringing Christians together in co-operation. The direct object of this Christian co-operation, as distinct from that of other bodies, was "to bring Christ into every part of common life".[3] For this purpose a common meal was necessary, and this necessity was made a sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.

There were two things which destroyed such a conception of the Church. The first was the making of a false distinction between spiritual and secular things, thereby removing a large area of affairs from the Church's life. The second was the destruction of this "principle of co-operation", by which every member of the body had an active part in its life, and the substitution in its place of a system in which the few were active and the many passive. This second error, according to Arnold, was the error *par excellence* of the Oxford Movement. The Newmanites, he said, were right in thinking that what was needed was a recovery of a high doctrine of the Church. What they had found, however, was a doctrine of the ministry. Against this confusion and the evil consequences which he thought flowed from it Arnold fought with vigour. The mistake, he said, arose from the primary emphasis which the Newmanites placed on the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession. The effect of this was to make a separation between clergy and laity, ascribing to the former what belonged to the whole Body and making the life of the Church dependent on its ordained ministry. Thus, in a sense, ordination had been made more important than baptism. Had the Newmanites turned to the Scriptures for their doctrine of the Church their conclusions, Arnold thought, would have been very different. As it was he followed Coleridge in believing that this appropriation by the clergy of what was properly applicable to the

[1] Stanley, *Arnold's Life and Correspondence* (1845), I, 283
[2] Arnold's *Sermons* (1849), Vol. IV. p. xlvii. [3] *Fragment*, p. 8.

whole Church "constituted the first and fundamental apostacy".[1] Indeed, the error ran so deep that it was there before the Oxford Movement began and was in substance accepted by most of the laity:

> "Men continually seem to forget that they are members of the Church; citizens, to use St Paul's expression, of Christ's Kingdom, as much as ever they are citizens of their earthly country. But they speak of the Church as they might speak of any useful institution or society in their neighbourhood, whose objects they approved of, and which they were glad to encourage, but without becoming members of it, or identifying themselves with its success or failure."[2]

Arnold was at pains to make this point clear because in many other ways he was in sympathy with the Oxford Movement:

> "No wise man doubts that the Reformation was imperfect or that in the Romish system there were many good institutions, and practices, and feelings, which it would be most desirable to restore amongst ourselves. Daily Church services, frequent communions, memorials of our Christian calling continually presented to our notice, in crosses and wayside oratories; commemorations of holy men, of all times and countries; the doctrine of the communion of saints practically taught; religious orders, especially of women, of different kinds, and under different rules, delivered only from the snare and sin of perpetual vows; all these, most of which are of some efficacy for good, even in a corrupt church, belong no less to the true Church and would there be purely beneficial."[3]

Similarly, among the reforms of the Church which Arnold advocated was a revival of the significance of the order of deacons. It was, he thought, deplorable that the distinguishing mark of a deacon had come to be the negative condition that he could not celebrate the Holy Communion. Deacons, especially in the large manufacturing towns, could be a link between the rest of the clergy and laity; if they also had secular employment, so much the better: "I suppose no one is so mad as to maintain that a minister abstaining from all secular calling is a matter of necessity, seeing that St Paul carried on his trade as a tent maker even when he was an apostle".[4] There should also be more provision in the government of the Church for the laity; clergy in the industrial areas who would understand the condition of the people and be understood by them, and an increase of bishoprics in order to give the new manufacturing towns more pastoral attention. All these things might help people to see that church questions were not "such merely or principally, as concerned the payment of the clergy, or their discipline, but all questions in which God's glory and man's sins or duties are concerned; all questions in the decision of which there is a moral good and evil".[5] In this doctrine of the Church Arnold saw all else as involved. In the context of contemporary England he saw the Church had a part to play, but what was the Church and what were the fields of its inactivity?

> "When we look at the condition of our country; at the poverty and wretchedness of so large a portion of the working classes; at the intellectual

[1] S. T. Coleridge, *Literary Remains* (1838), III, 386. [2] *Sermons*, pp. 412 f.
[3] Ibid., pp. lvi f. [4] *Life*, Vol. II, p. 151. [5] *Sermons*, p. 425.

> and moral evils which certainly exist among the poor, but by no means among the poor only; and when we witness the many partial attempts to remedy these evils—attempts benevolent indeed and wise, so far as they go, but utterly unable to strike to the heart of the mischief; can any Christian doubt that here is the work for the Church of Christ to do; that none else can do it and that with the blessing of her Almighy Head she can."[1]

In the century since Arnold died many of the questions he raised have received a great deal of discussion and the different circumstances of to-day inevitably date some of his opinions. We may, perhaps, wonder if there is not more to be said for the limited purpose which Locke and Warburton allowed the State. They, living nearer 1688, and we living closer to 1984, may see possible drawbacks in the view Arnold was concerned to advance. However that may be, we must surely applaud the way that Arnold tackled these great questions of Church and State with reference to what he conceived to be the theological truths which underlay them—not merely on the level of how bishops should be appointed and churches filled. But perhaps the greatest profit to be derived from studying Arnold is the realization that his concern is always with both Church and State; neither is allowed to exclude the other. The reader of Arnold will find a great deal to support a renewed and strengthened doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ, but nothing to encourage the Church of England to become sectarian. He will also find much to point the need for Christians, away from their ecclesiastical surroundings, to bring their influence to bear on the nation at large; but nothing to suggest that this can be done without the Body of Christ. Arnold's concern was twofold—to christianize the nation and edify the Church.

DENIS PAYNE.

New Zealand Letter

FAITH AND ORDER, 1955

QUITE the most significant event of theological interest last year was the second New Zealand Faith and Order Conference held in May at Sumner, near Christchurch, under the chairmanship of the Reverend H. L. Fiebig, President of the New Zealand Council of Churches. By a happy arrangement a conference of theological students organized by the Student Christian Movement met at the same time in the same centre. Although the fifty students present followed a program of their own, they were permitted to attend the plenary sessions of the main conference.

Both conferences were greatly enriched by the presence and contributions of visitors from abroad. These included the Rev. Dr J. Robert Nelson, Secretary of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches, the Rev. Dr D. Broughton Knox, representing the Australian Council for the World Council of

[1] *Sermons*, pp. lxv f.

Churches, and the Rev. R. Gregor Smith, editor of the S.C.M. Press. Mr Gregor Smith provided a pleasant evening in lighter vein with his humorous "Theological Chit-Chat".

The first New Zealand Faith and Order Conference took place in 1947 at Marsden School, Wellington, and was attended by one hundred and sixty-five representatives from the Churches constituting the National Council of Churches (Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, Congregational, Church of Christ, Salvation Army, Society of Friends). The topics then under discussion were Grace, the Church, the Ministry and the Sacraments. A significant but unfortunate feature of the report of the 1947 conference was the number of minority statements (nine in all) appended to the various sections of it. Despite the tendency in "God's own country" to multiply minority reports, this probably indicates an inadequate method of procedure which, fortunately, was remedied at the second conference.

In December 1950 a consultative conference of forty members met at Wallis House, Lower Hutt, in order to advise the National Council of Churches about further steps in Faith and Order. It was resolved to approach the member Churches officially with the request that certain matters should be discussed by them and their opinions embodied in denominational statements. By 1953 these statements had been received. They were co-ordinated by preparatory commissions and published, together with suggestions for further study, in a booklet, *Towards the One Church*. The preparatory commissions then set to work to compile material for discussion at a second Faith and Order conference.

The four main themes at the Sumner meeting were "The Disunity of the Church", "Church Order and the Scriptures", "Ordination" and "Authority". These were introduced at the plenary sessions, usually by the chairman of the appropriate preparatory commission. His statement was followed by two short addresses from speakers of a contrasting viewpoint. Then the conference divided into sections and spent two sessions discussing the theme in the light of questions chosen by the Steering Committee. The findings in the form of concise replies to the questions were handed on to the Steering Committee, which saw that they were co-ordinated and presented at a later plenary session.

It was at this point that a suggestion from Dr Nelson about procedure proved invaluable. It was decided to choose one man, who was allowed to name his own collaborator, to prepare a statement on the theme embodying the findings of all the sections. This statement in the form of a series of headings with short amplificatory sentences was put into the hands of the one hundred and ten delegates as they returned to the plenary session. The text of the statement was then expounded by its composer, debated, amended where necessary and approved.

No official report of the conference has been prepared but the approved statements on the four themes, together with a message to the Churches, were published in the July issue of *Church and Com-*

munity, the monthly journal of the New Zealand National Council of Churches.

A few samples from the statements may, perhaps, be of interest. On the subject of the disunity of the Church it was asserted: "The Church is a Divine creation and is one. The Church's unity is obscured by her divisions. Each denomination embodies a richness of diversity which is a fruit of the Spirit. Diversity made exclusive and issuing in an independent fellowship claiming self-sufficiency disrupts the manifest unity of the Body. Diversity thus becomes division and as such it is sinful; persistence in division is a defiance of God's final purpose for his Church. A Divine imperative is laid upon the Church to heal her divisions and to work towards unity."

On Church Order and the Scriptures three headings read: "The Word of God is God's revelation of his creating and redeeming activity as set forth in the Scriptures. Church Order must be agreeable to the Word of God. There is no Scriptural authority which warrants any of the Churches insisting that its order alone is agreeable to the Word of God."

In its statement about Ordination, after indicating the area of agreement among the Churches and certain points of difference, the conference remarked: "There is a wide readiness to consider an episcopal order as an indispensable element in any plan for a united Church; but there is need for further examination of what would be involved in the establishment of a ministry thus united and in the operation of episcopacy in the united Church. No minister is prepared to be re-ordained if this would imply a fundamental defect in his previous ministry and most feel that any re-ordination would imply this. Many, however, desire a full mutual recognition of our ministries and would accept a commissioning by properly recognized representatives for the wider ministry in a united Church."

On Authority the following points, amongst others, were made: "Primary and ultimate authority is to be found in God as revealed in his Son Jesus Christ our Lord. God has chosen to declare his authority through the Scriptures, through the Church and through the testimony of the Holy Spirit, but these are so inter-related that it is artificial and impossible to set them in order of priority. . . . Authority in the ordered life of the Church is entrusted by God to the whole Church and it is exercised in some matters by the local congregation, in some matters by district gatherings representative of several congregations and in some matters by assemblies representative of the whole denomination, in each case the laity sharing with the ministry in the exercise of this authority. . . . The important emphases of Episcopal, Presbyteral and Congregational policy may be held together as complementary elements in one Church order."

Readers of these statements, excerpts only of which have been given, will look in vain for anything novel. These subjects have been covered more adequately by abler men elsewhere, but the fact remains that this is the most significant adventure towards theological understanding to date which has taken place in New Zealand. Chris-

tians in this remote part of the world have gone some distance locally and together towards appreciating the issues which divide them. Such a process will have to continuue simultaneously throughout the world wherever Christians of differing denominations are living and working side by side.

The impact of this conference on the community of Christchurch must not be overlooked. The crowded opening service in the cathedral was broadcast, eleven hundred people attended a final public meeting and sixty-six congregations welcomed to their pulpits delegates of another Communion than their own.

A continuing commission has been appointed under the chairmanship of Canon R. E. Sutton, Warden of St John's College, Auckland. Its twenty-two members have been divided into two sections to facilitate discussion on the nature of the Church, the first topic selected for further consideration.

MONROE PEASTON.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. Hugh Casson is Vicar of Orton on the Hill with Twycross in the diocese of Leicester.

The Right Rev. Glyn Simon has been Bishop of Swansea and Brecon since 1954.

The Rev. Denis Payne is Chaplain of Makerere College, Uganda.

The Rev. Monroe Peaston is Master of College House, Christchurch, New Zealand.

CORRESPONDENCE

DEACONS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The articles on the Diaconate in your November number provide us with a considerable amount of valuable information. But the sum of their divergent outlooks is somewhat negative, and it is hard to extract from them any clear picture of the real significance of the deacon's office.

In the first two articles the search for scholarly impartiality leads, as so often, to an external view. In the third the general liturgical import of the deacon is underestimated in favour of the particular spirituality of the priest-deacon relationship. In the fourth an attempt is made to reduce the diaconate, from very early times if not from the very beginning, to a mere step in the ecclesiastical *cursus honorum*. The last, which catalogues Protestant interpretations of the diaconate, brings us back to the Scriptural reference in a list of functions which is too narrow on the liturgical side, and omits the catechetical function, but otherwise is not inadequate.

If we try to place ourselves within the early Church tradition, and

recognize that the *onus probandi* is on those who would deny to this tradition the Scriptural basis which it claimed, a clear and vital picture is obtained of a ministry, continuous from Apostolic times onwards, and quite distinct from the presbyterate, in which the functions of almoner, administrator, liturgical minister and evangelist are intimately united.

It is true that, in Greek, words which early acquired a technical sense never quite lost their etymological meaning. Even the word ἐπίσκοπος is used as late as St John Climacus (early 7th century) of officials in a monastery who certainly were not "bishops". In the case of διάκονος and its derivatives, ambiguity is still more frequent over the whole Patristic period: and in N.T. it is only in 1 Timothy and Philippians that we can with reasonable certainty assume for the word a technical meaning. But the opposite is equally true—absence of the *term* in other contexts in no way precludes the possibility of reference to the *office* to which the term came to be applied. And reason would seem to support tradition in seeing in the appointment of the Seven the foundation of the historic diaconate. Here, as in the case of bishop (St James) and presbyters, Jerusalem was surely providing the pattern for other Churches to follow (cf. 1 Thess. 2. 14). Even the Apostle's claim to the "diaconate of the word" may be read as an insistence that the "diaconate of tables", for which very soon the term tended to be reserved, was not the only way of obeying our Lord's injunction to be "deacon of all". But the sense of "waiter" for the deacons of tables is too exclusive. "Bank clerk" is an equally possible, and perhaps more apposite, meaning, if we consider the function of "almoner", which is clearly in view.

This passage, and the coupling of the diaconate with the episcopate in both Philippians and 1 Timothy, combines with the evidence of Ignatius, etc., to show us the bishop and deacons closely linked together as the executive of a Church, while the bishop and presbyters form the deliberative council.

Whether or no the "diaconate of tables" has in Acts any direct reference to the Table of the Lord's Supper, it is natural to suppose that from the beginning deacons, as well as bishop and presbyters, had functions assigned to them in the Liturgy which mirrored the parts they played in the daily life of the Church outside, while also providing, for those who could understand, an "ikonic" representation of Divine Truth. St Clement of Rome already seems to imply the threefold liturgical ministry; while St Ignatius brings most naturally to our minds the fully developed architectural and liturgical order of a Church as known to us from later centuries—the bishop enthroned as a type of God the Father in the apse, with the Apostle-like council of the presbyters seated on either hand, while his most intimate link is with the deacons standing below, after the pattern of Christ who came among us "as he who plays the deacon".

Just as, outside, the deacon or archdeacon is concerned with the detailed administration of the church's goods, so in church he is found receiving and ordering the people's gifts, and bringing them to the bishop or priest at the Offertory (this is the primitive plan:

only later does the priest order the Prothesis, or himself bring in the gifts at the Great Entrance). The details of the service are his care: and he assists in one way or another in the actual administration of Communion. He is concerned with both the practical and the catechetical preparation for baptism, and has his part in the administration of that sacrament also. In all this he is aptly taken by the Pseudo-Denys to represent the "purgative way", where the presbyter stands for the illuminative and the bishop for the unitive.

But it is in the normal Liturgy of the Church as still seen to-day in Churches of the Eastern rites that the function of the deacon stands out most clearly. Apart from the reading of the Gospel (an echo of the "evangelist" function of St Philip, which can be seen as linked to the catechetical work), he is a kind of "master of ceremonies"—telling the people what to do or what to pray for ("Let us pray the Lord", "Draw near", "Bow your heads", etc.); directing the priest or the bishop with respectful authority ("Bless, my lord", etc.);[1] but not in his own person addressing prayer directly to God—the three apparent exceptions to this rule are of doubtful antiquity and interpretation. He is, indeed, "least of all and servant of all". At the same time he is, as it were, the "pulse" of the Liturgy. And he leaves the bishop and priests free from care of the minutiae, to turn their minds to their proper functions of "prayer and the ministry of the word"—in church just as outside.

In the Eastern rite the deacon's part can never really be taken by a priest. One of the celebrant priests may indeed have, in the absence of a deacon, to lead the litanies and pronounce the other biddings to the people, but he is still vested as a priest, and the biddings to priest or bishop have to be omitted; and the Liturgy is felt in some measure to lose its character.

Equally outside, it is clear at least in the case of the archdeacon that in East and West alike his functions were for centuries regarded as proper to his order, and therefore to be relinquished on ordination to the priesthood.

It may be regarded as a disaster for the Western Church that in the early Middle Ages the archdeacons became strong enough, as against the bishops, to retain their functions—and powers—even after ordination to the priesthood.[2] But it has to be admitted that in the East also, though the archdeacon has remained in his order, most of his administrative functions have gradually been taken over by the *protosyncellus* or other priestly official.

So the original conception of the deacon's vocation has been obscured. And yet, even when narrowed to the liturgical function, it may still appear as a distinct vocation in itself, to which some at least may be called for life when they have no vocation to the priesthood. Even a deep bass voice, if Fr Gillet will forgive me for saying

[1] In all this, the deacon binds together priest (or bishop) and people. Fr Bligh is quite wrong, at least so far as the *ethos* of the Byzantine rite is concerned, in supposing that he separates between them.

[2] The Anglican Church is probably unique in having suffragan *bishops* as archdeacons!

so, may be an offering acceptable to God. Much more does the distinctness of the vocation appear if we widen it to the full original conception—a distinctive hallowing of the detailed administrative business of the church, which at the same time is taken off the shoulders of the priests and (though inevitably less completely) of the bishops, who are thus left free for their own proper work. Fr Bligh's argument, that now there are plenty of priests to do the administrative work, and there is no need of deacons for it, does not face at all the possibility that these functions actually distract a priest from his real calling.

What, in fact, would be involved in the restoration of a diaconate so understood? Our present archdeacons relieved of that burdensome office and free to concentrate on their proper episcopal or priestly functions; the lay staffs of our diocesan offices, and secretaries and treasurers of committees, etc., and no doubt others on the parochial level, ordained to the diaconate (their chiefs as archdeacons), their work revealed neither as a mere "job" nor as a hobby, but as a sacred life-long vocation, carrying with it corresponding functions in the order of the Church's worship, which would be recognizably distinct from those of the priesthood. Surely many such lay officials to-day must regard their work as a real vocation, and are worthy to have it so hallowed; nor would it come amiss for many civil servants and others in their retirement who may have no calling to the priesthood. It would of course continue to be right and natural for aspirants to the priesthood to serve a year or so in the diaconate—not only as a term of probation but also to learn something of what was involved in the business of the Church, from the care of which they would, in the priesthood, be excluded. But the majority of deacons would be likely to remain in that office for life.

Many secondary questions would arise. For instance, this restoration of the diaconate might well mean more, rather than less, work for the diocesan *bishop*, who must inevitably remain head of the executive; and the only solution might be the raising of most of our present dioceses to provincial, and our archdeaconries to diocesan, status. Again, would not the ordination of many deaconesses be inevitable, as in the early Church, with no sharp distinction between their order and that of the male diaconate?

Of course, we must beware of an archaeological attitude. However admirable the picture of the original function of the diaconate may appear on paper, the fact that it does not seem in practice to have withstood the onslaught of the centuries must at least make us hesitate before embarking on any revolutionary plan to restore it. But it is still more dangerous to reject old things ready to perish just because they are old, when their renovation may offer the solution of present-day problems. The picture is at least worth looking at.

One thing must be clear. All that we have said has little if anything to do with projects of a "part-time" diaconate, which would mean hardly more than an ordination of lay-readers with little change in their functions—a make-shift palliative for the shortage of priests. If the diaconate is a distinct sacred function, then on prin-

ciple a part-time diaconate is neither more nor less legitimate than a part-time priesthood. The answer is that in both cases the vocation must be conceived of as a whole-time vocation, but that in each case this vocation is not necessarily inconsistent with the holding of certain other "jobs". Some such occupations have always been recognized as legitimate. Perhaps to-day the list needs extending. And probably the list for the diaconate should not be the same as that for the priesthood.

May I add one word of protest, in which I know I speak for many others? It is shocking that the tutor of an Anglican Theological College should allow himself to speak of "nibbling" the Eucharistic Bread. The Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, and the Church of the age of the Martyrs, are not matters of which we should presume to speak with flippancy.

One error in Fr Bligh's article should be pointed out. On p. 425 "ne videant *qui* videre non debeant" is mistranslated "lest they see *what* they ought not to see". The effect on the sense of the passage is considerable.

Finally, Mr Editor, may I thank you and congratulate you for opening up in the number of which I have been writing a subject which I believe to be of very great importance.

Upton Rectory, Derwas J. Chitty.
Didcot.

The Rev. R. P. Symonds writes:

"I offer no apology to Mr Chitty. It is his idea, not mine, that the words that excite him are flippant. If my words offend, it may well be that the Church of the age of the martyrs of which they speak would in some matters, if he could see it as it was, prove offensive. My words imply no judgment on the practice described. What about the use of *trōgein* in John 6. 54, gnaw, crunch, chew—so Grimm-Thayer; in Hoskyns, munch? Is all this within the Chittian canons of decorum? But should Mr Chitty be demanding something like an uncritical veneration of the Church in any age of its god-sustained existence, then indeed I protest; and no doubt there will be many to approve such a caveat."

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

I have read with great interest the November 1955 issue of Theology discussing the historic diaconate. Permit me to add a comment and a correction.

A. *Comment.* Up to the time of the dissolution of episcopacy in the Waldensian Church, both deacons and presbyters were ordained by bishops. Following their ordination, the deacons had to study for several years in the Waldensian School at Milan prior to their preaching tours (see Ernesto Comba, *Storia dei Valdesi,* Torre Pellice, 1950 ed., p. 52). The diaconate, then, in the early Waldensian Church,

was essentially a period of preparation. Following the Swiss Reformation the Waldensians adopted the Presbyterian system, which prevails to this day.

B. *Correction.* Mr J. M. Ross speaks of the "Moravians or Hussites" as if they were synonyms for one movement or Church. Actually they are not and there is a vast difference between these two groups. October 28, 1414, is the founding date of the Hussite Church, for on that day the Feast of SS. Simon and Jude, the Lord's Supper was celebrated for the first time in centuries in both kinds; in time, this "Utraquist" Church was destined to become one of the two established Churches of the Kingdom of Bohemia. This condition prevailed until 1620, when it was proscribed. The Moravian Church had its beginning in 1457 as a perfectionist movement inspired by the writings of Chelcicky. The Hussite Reformation preserved the catholic character of the Church, with the threefold order of deacons, priests and bishops. The Moravian Church established its independent continuity by electing its first "seniors" or bishops. The line of the Moravian bishops from Bohemia ends with the deaths of Figulus in January 1670 and of Comenius ten months later. The Moravian Church of which Mr Ross speaks is not the one which originated in Bohemia. What he is referring to is the "Renewed" Moravian Church created in Herrnhut in 1727 by Count Zinzendorf, under strong Lutheran pietistic influences. Organizationally it is quite different from the original Church in Bohemia and, theologically, there are no similarities whatsoever.

It is a real source of satisfaction to be able to read your excellent journal. With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ENRICO C. S. MOLNAR.

ST TIMOTHY'S EPISCOPAL CHURCH,
COMPTON, CALIFORNIA.

29 *November* 1955.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Having read your very valuable number about the diaconate I feel I ought to draw your attention to the fact that Mr J. M. Ross is not quite right when he states (p. 436) that only the "Innere Mission" type of diaconate exists in Scandinavia. In Denmark we have still retained in every parish a lay diaconate which dates from the Middle Ages. It is so old that the name *diaconus* in the course of the centuries has been corrupted into the Danish word *degn*. This peculiar spelling—and the even more peculiar pronunciation (the nearest approximate in English is, I think, the word *dine*!)—must be the cause of the mistake.

In each Danish parish there is one, and only one, *degn*. He assists the rector in the keeping of the parish registers of births, baptisms, burials, etc. In church his duties are the old diaconal duties: he prepares the altar for the service, kindles (and extinguishes) the altar lights, places the sacred vessels and bread and wine on the altar, and

helps the priest to put on and take off the vestments. He reads the opening and concluding prayers in all services—these prayers are so much felt to be a special liturgical function of the *degn* that they are very seldom read by the priest. If the *degn* is ill or on holiday they are read by a substitute, and only if it is absolutely impossible to get someone to act as *degn* will the priest read these prayers, but not from the altar: he will leave the altar and go to the place between the nave and the choir where it is customary for the *degn* to read these prayers!

In country parishes the *degn* nowadays generally is a school teacher, and besides his other duties in church he leads the singing of the responses and the hymns. He is therefore often called the "church singer".

In town parishes the *degn* is a full-time official of the church, assisting the priests in many ways throughout the week. He is called *Kordegn* (choir deacon) because he serves in the choir, but in these churches he has nothing to do with the singing choir!

The *degn* does not receive an ordination, but in some churches a simple form of "installation" (without imposition of hands) is used. Being a lay person he cannot go inside the altar rails during service, except when it is absolutely necessary. In older times he "put the vestments on and off the priest" before the altar, but in this century it has become common use to do this in the vestry.

The "Innere Mission" kind of deacon is called a *diakon*. He gets a special training, mainly centred upon nursing and social welfare work. He is not ordained, but receives a special blessing (with imposition of hands) from the head of the training institute, who is a priest, not a bishop. Our *diakons* mostly work in nursing homes, hospitals, asylums or in charitable church institutions.

Yours faithfully,

COPENHAGEN. SVEND BORREGAARD.

THE SACRIFICE OF PRAISE

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I write to dispute the premises of Professor Fuller's question in the October issue, "Are Evangelicals prepared to abandon their insular attachment to 1662" with regard to the position of the prayer of oblation?

1. The Church of England is avowedly (Article 34) national, and therefore "insular" should not be used by an Anglican as a term of reproach; we have always used our insular language in public worship (and allowed our offshoots to use theirs) rather than attempt anything more catholic and international. But until comparatively recently the 1662 order did have within the Anglican communion the great emotional advantage of being *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus,* and I for one regret the diversity introduced after

a uniformity of about 300 years in the vain pursuit of a wider, but at present quite unattainable, catholicity.

2. Whether or not some Evangelicals identify "the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" merely with "the thanksgiving for the reception of the Holy Communion", as Professor Fuller says they do, this is certainly not a necessary consequence of "relegating it to the post-Communion". What the 1552 order of service did surely (*pace* Canon Sansbury, April 1954) was to make clear that the Communion itself, and not the mere consecration and oblation by a priest of bread and wine, is the Church's participation in the "full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice" of Christ, and it achieved this by the novel means of placing the communion of the people centrally within the framework of the old "canon of the Mass". There is nothing anomalous about this. The assumptions which I question are that, because the words "this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" are used after the Communion, they have therefore (*a*) ceased to be part of "the great eucharistic prayer itself", and (*b*) ceased to refer to the Communion itself.

Would it not be wiser to persuade both Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals to come to a common mind in the truth that the element of sacrifice is to be found neither in the mere consecration and oblation nor in the mere thanksgiving for reception but in the whole eucharistic action of the Holy Communion while continuing to use the Prayer Book order of service, rather than encourage them to find the same common mind in a changed order of service with all the acrimonious argument and the upset of conservative predilections (my own included) which such a change would be bound to involve? Even if it be conceded that the time is ripe for general liturgical revision, and our Communion service were to be enriched with some such prayer of thanksgiving as Mr Couratin envisages, I should plead above all for the retention of the Communion itself in the central position to which it was moved in 1552 not by some ultra-Protestant Cranmerian aberration, and in which it has been used ever since by English churchmen of all schools of thought.

And I should go further. I should demand that whatever the (quite proper) variety of modes of worship within Ecclesia Anglicana throughout the world, in this one central act there should be the uniformity which we have loved long since and lost awhile.

There speaks conservatism, grateful for the devoted biblicism and the reconciling spirit both of Mr Couratin's sermon and of Professor Fuller's letter, but with a more passionate (though not, one hopes, entirely obscurantist and unreasoning) devotion to tradition. Let innovators be warned that they will also have a far deeper unreasoning conservatism to contend against: others besides Evangelicals have an insular attachment to 1662.

Yours faithfully,
ADRIAN CAREY.

ILLINGWORTH VICARAGE,
HALIFAX.
16 *November* 1955.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Professor Fuller made some very kind comments in your October number on a sermon of mine which you had published in August, and asked me whether I would agree that the "great prayer of thanksgiving should pass on to petition" for the fruits of communion. It may be that in a modern liturgy it would be desirable to include such petitions in the Eucharistic Prayer. But unless I have completely misread the evidence, the prayer did not contain such petitions in the earliest stages of the liturgical tradition.

So far as I understand the matter, Christians in the Apostolic Age regarded themselves as the Holy People of God, called out of darkness into light and constituted a Royal Priesthood by Baptism (1 Pet. 2. 9). They fulfilled that Priesthood by obeying their Lord's command (1 Cor. 11. 24–25) and by uttering their Thanksgiving *over* Bread and Cup (Mark 14. 22–23). In their Thanksgiving they proclaimed the *aretai*, the mighty works, of God in Creation and Redemption (1 Pet. 2. 9), and especially the supreme work of God, the death of the Lord (1 Cor. 11. 26). By uttering their Thanksgiving over Bread and Cup, they constituted them as Thankofferings, and so offered them as spiritual sacrifices to God, and were concerned that they should be acceptable to God through the mediation of the Christ (1 Pet. 2. 5). (If the Manna and the Water from the Rock can be described as spiritual meat and drink in 1 Cor. 10. 3–4, presumably the Bread and Cup, of which they are the types, can be described as spiritual sacrifices in 1 Pet. 2. 5.) Their offering of the sacrifice of praise to God through Christ involved them in a confession to the Name (Heb. 13. 15), and their whole attention seems to have been absorbed in giving glory to God.

When these ideas work themselves out in the liturgical tradition, a pattern of Eucharistic Prayer emerges. First comes Thanksgiving for Creation and Redemption; next comes Offering, e.g. *offerimus tibi panem et calicem* (Hippolytus, Trad. Ap., iv 11); and next comes Petition for the Acceptance of the Offering through the mediation of the Christ, e.g. *per manus sancti angeli tui in sublime altare tuum* (*Canon Missae*; for the angel cf. LXX Isa. 9. 6; for the altar cf. Isa. 6. 6). Finally, with the acceptance of the offerings upon the heavenly altar and the consequent admission to the heavenly worship, comes the Confession to the Name in the singing of the heavenly *Sanctus* (Isa. 6. 3; Apocalypse 4. 8; 5. 11–14). The Pattern may have already been familiar to Clement, and he may be referring incidentally to the Offering, when he talks of the *episcopoi* as "those who have offered the gifts" (1 Clement 44. 4), and to the Petition for their Acceptance through the mediation of the Christ, when he calls the Lord "the High Priest of our offerings" (1 Clement 36. 1).

The Church of England is divided about the content of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. It is impossible therefore at the moment to go beyond the language of the Prayer of Oblation, which is capable of more than one interpretation. But the Church of England is in agree-

ment about the content of the Eucharistic Thanksgiving. It would therefore be a comparatively simple matter to construct out of phrases from the Bible and the Prayer Book a new Proper Preface, giving thanks for Creation and Redemption through the Christ, and to secure authorization for its use on all days when no other Proper Preface is provided.

Yours faithfully,
A. H. Couratin.

St Stephen's House,
Oxford.
17 *December* 1955.

A NON-PROFESSIONAL MINISTRY

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

Your correspondent, the Rev. J. L. Badger, fears that a non-professional part-time priest would be "static ecclesiastically, and would tend to maintain the old traditions". There are two points to be made about this.

In the first place, is it not true to say that one of the greatest problems facing the Church of England at the present time is that the clergy are too mobile? Livings change hands with dazzling rapidity, and while it is true that changes in parochial policy brought about by a new incumbent are often beneficial, the best work in the Church is at present being done by men enlisting lay co-operation over a long period. They should have part-time priests to assist them.

Secondly, a good deal of thought needs to be given to the training of part-time clergy. They would have to be trained to a far higher degree than the majority of laymen to-day, and to be given continuing opportunities for wider contacts, keeping them in touch with currents of thought in the diocese and beyond. If this were done, it need not follow that such men would be opposed to necessary changes; on the contrary, they might well be far more likely than most laymen to take a share in promoting missionary policies in parish life.

Certainly no one can predict with accuracy what the effect of ordaining such men would be. But a timid fear of certain possible results is a poor answer to a crying necessity on theological and practical grounds.

Yours sincerely,
Michael Jackson.
S. Booth-Clibborn.

Carbrook Church House,
Freeston Place,
Sheffield, 9.
15 *December* 1955.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE. By Jean Mouroux. Transl. by G. R. Lamb. Sheed and Ward. 16s.

AN EXISTENTIALIST THEOLOGY. By John Macquarrie. The Library of Philosophy and Theology. S.C.M. Press. 18s.

Both of these books may be said to mark a new direction in the contemporary theological outlook—a shift from "objectivity" towards "subjectivity", a fresh consideration of the impact of the content of faith upon the believer, a return to the concept of "experience". The fortunes of this latter word have within the space of a generation or so undergone notable changes. In the heyday of liberalism they stood high: religion was to be verified empirically, and experience became both the guarantee and the test of Christian "truth". Then came a sharp reaction. Dogma was reinstated in the interests of the sheer "givenness" of revelation. Indeed in certain extremer instances of this phase of thinking incomprehensibility seemed to be the distinguishing property of what man can accept only as *ganz anderes*. The very term "religious experience" entered the vocabulary of theological opprobrium. Now, however, under existentialist influences, the "subject" of knowledge has regained significance, and the Kierkegaardian aphorism, that "truth is in subjectivity", has become the epigraph of a new movement, or at least the pointer to a new tendency.

The title of Abbé Mouroux' volume is itself arresting. Fifteen or twenty years ago the phrase would have found a discreter use. But, as M. Mouroux observes at starting, the problem posed by the Christian experience necessarily arises in any philosophy of religion, or in any theology, and in the Christian consciousness does so in an acute form. Truly: for if the fact of Christ is not integrated into the substance of the believer's spiritual and moral life, does not in truth become an interpretative clue to his whole experience, Christianity remains merely notional and faith an abstract possibility. It is most appropriate for us, therefore, to consider this fact in terms of human apprehension, human knowledge. Further, as M. Mouroux admits, the contemporary consciousness is such as to make this problem more urgent than ever. "To-day experience is all-important, for we live in an age of experiences." The remark, alas, is a platitude; but if Christianity is to be effectually communicated to the modern world it must needs appear in its own true character, historically demonstrable, as a significant—the all-significant—*mode* of experience. M. Mouroux' aim has been to present us with (as he modestly puts it) "a kind of introduction to" a theology of Christian experience—a rational analysis of Christianity (for him, of course, Roman Catholic Christianity) not so much "given" as "known experimentally". With mysticism, as with the psychological aspect of his subject more generally—certainly with the kind of "psychologism" which preoccupied William James—he is, however, not concerned. What interests him is experience understood as "a grasp of reality". Hence

also his disregard of it as "a quest of truth", his purpose, unlike that of the Catholic Modernists, from whose standpoint his own is at a safe remove, being in no way apologetic. He accepts the data of faith without question, and within his necessary, or self-prescribed, limits his account of "what it means to be a Christian" is impressive enough. But for penetration it does not compare with Laberthonnière's work on the same lines. This book is readably translated, but lacks an index.

The most challenging presentation of the new ideas comes from Rudolf Bultmann, in whom Christian theology and the current *Existenzphilosophie* coalesce: "demythologizing" is to have its fitting counterpart in a Theology of Existence, for the development of which the non-theistic metaphysic of Heidegger has been put to service. The main characteristic of modern existentialism is its claim to have reinstated man, in face of the dehumanized and misleading "objectivism" which, for those who choose to adopt what is called the scientific attitude, alone establishes the conditions of valid knowledge. *L'existentialisme*, says Sartre, *est un humanisme*. For Bultmann, who approaches Christianity from the human or experiential angle, the Kerygma—enshrined in the primitive Christian myth—is primarily an affirmation about the condition of man. (Karl Barth has accused him of having reduced Christianity to an anthropology.) In it man rediscovers himself and arrives at a new self-knowledge (*Selbstverständnis*), in which he is confronted with the necessity of a decisive choice. Bultmann's doctrine here relies very largely on Heidegger's well-known distinction between *Dasein* authentic (*eigentlich*) and inauthentic (*uneigentlich*), and on his conception of man's "fallenness" (*Verfallenheit*), the implications of which in a Christian context are plainly evident. (Cf. *Sein und Zeit*, pp. 166–80.)

What Bultmann has done—though criticism of his position has been plentiful (and in this country not always very discerning)—is to secure a *rapprochement* between philosophy and theology at a moment when their relations seem to have been severed, and to have applied to Christian thinking those categories in which, despite a varying and obscure terminology, the existentialists seem to be more or less at one. Bultmann knows that his own effort is not exhaustive, but rather (as he hopes) a guide and stimulus to further work in the same direction. But by the fertility of his suggestions he has become the most significant figure in post-war theology.

Mr Macquarrie's study of Heidegger's influence on Bultmann is much to be commended for its lucid, informative and unprejudiced review and exposition of its theme. But though its immediate aim is restricted its value lies not merely in the presentation of other men's ideas. It is itself a welcome sign—as one of the first in the proposed S.C.M. Press series to which it belongs and in which Bultmann's own translated *Essays* are also now included—of a new concern on the part of theologians—Mr Macquarrie is a lecturer in Systematic Theology in the University of Glasgow—with the bearings of philosophy upon their own discipline, and of that, in its turn, upon

philosophy. Apart from the fact that it is unhealthy for theology, whether "biblical" or any other, to become an intellectual *hortus inclusus,* the apologetic need is ever with us. It changes its form from age to age, and its satisfaction can never be achieved once for all. And the apologist, if a truly philosophical theologian, will not despise any contemporary attempt, be it only sincere and clear-headed, to interpret the thought and experience of the times.

Bernard M. G. Reardon.

Kelly, Devon.

Histoire et Vérité. By Paul Ricœur. Éditions du Seuil. 600 frs.

The True and the Valid. By R. I. Aaron. (The Dr Williams Lecture for 1954.) Oxford University Press. 3s. 6d.

Readers who got their philosophical grounding this side of the Channel in the past fifteen years are likely to be taken aback by the first two chapter-headings in *Histoire et Vérité.* Here, placed in juxtaposition, with full confidence that they treat of kindred themes, are a study in the philosophy of history and a study in the history of philosophy. It is hard to imagine any writer in British philosophical circles since the death of Collingwood having both the equipment and the audacity for such a venture. M. Ricœur is both professor of the history of philosophy at Strasbourg and a member of the staff of the journal *Esprit,* and this collection of essays, which falls into two sections corresponding to his professional and cultural interests respectively, displays a notable unity of approach and of method.

But if his subject-matter provokes comparison with Collingwood, his attitude to it stands in marked contrast. To begin with, he has apparently no first-hand experience, as had Collingwood, of the craft of the historian, and his contribution to our understanding of history is made from the point of view of the philosophically minded *reader.* On the other hand, his existentialist approach leaves him completely free from the historical relativism which characterized Collingwood's work. His existentialism is of course not that of Sartre, nor yet, by derivation, that of Marcel; but like Marcel and Mounier and many lesser lights in contemporary France he finds his inspiration in Germany, especially in the writings of Husserl and Jaspers. His tribute to the work of Emmanuel Mounier is, of all his essays, at once the strangest country for the English reader and the best introduction to the climate in which his own thinking is done. Finally, he is a believing Christian (of the Reformed Church) and a grasp of biblical theology and an eschatological perspective show up unobtrusively throughout his book.

His method of exposition is in fact a blend of the dialectical and the eschatological. He himself calls it *dialectique à synthèse ajournée*: by which he means that the tensions which he unfolds between opposed ideas (e.g. work—word; neighbour—social unit) or between successive stages of his analysis of, e.g., the historical process are neither resolved on the spot, in the manner of a Hegel who knows all the answers, nor yet abandoned, as by a Bradley, as irre-

soluble contradictions; but their resolution is seen ahead as an element in eschatological *hope*. He is obviously diffident about compounding philosophical and theological concepts in this way, and it is not without significance that the two essays in which the success of his method is most apparent, one on the Christian interpretation of history and one which distinguishes and relates man as *neighbour* and man as *social unit*, are precisely those which he is most hesitant, *qua* philosopher, to include in his collection, on the ground of Christian *parti pris*. But its value for the student of the historical process or of cultural trends, which are still in progress and in which he himself is involved, is undeniable. In M. Ricœur's hands it provides the framework for an analysis of modern technological civilization which is candid, discerning and realistic, and free alike from romantic illusions of progress and escapist nostalgia for the past.

If M. Ricœur sees his subject-matter panoramically, as from a mountain-top, Professor Aaron, following the British empirical tradition of whose earlier phases he has been so notable an expositor, sees his on a dissecting-table. His investigation of the distinction between the truth of assertions and the validity of inferences resolves itself into an examination of the status of the principle of consistency. Brushing aside both the Rationalists and the framers of alternative logics, he sees it pragmatically as an *assumption* borne out by our unvarying experience of the known world. He thus does away, as he admits, with all absolute distinctions between the logical and the empirical: a conclusion after Hume's own heart.

To review two such dissimilar works together inevitably provokes the question: Are both works of philosophy? Current usage in this country is overwhelmingly on the side of the dissecting-table. No purpose, admittedly, is served by a dispute about nomenclature. What, however, is much to be wished is that there should be philosophical discourse, however designated, about the nature and direction of contemporary culture. Among us this field is abandoned to the professional historians, with occasional intrusions from a philosopher writing, by his own admission, *en vacances*. It is a pity that the number of those who hold that the proper study of mankind is man does not include more persons professionally qualified to study him as a thinking being. M. Ricœur's book supplies a welcome corrective. It should find readers, and imitators.

Northolt. Humphrey Green.

History of the World's Alliance of Y.M.C.A.s. By C. P. Shedd and others. S.P.C.K. 27s. 6d.

Within its own inescapable limitations, this book substantially achieves what it sets out to do, namely to provide an objective and well-documented history of one of the most remarkable movements in Christendom from its birth one century ago to the present day. Of necessity it is the work of several writers, and of necessity it must fulfil the function of an historical reference compendium on the bookshelves of Local Associations. Therefore, of necessity, it is not

a dashing, tight-knit narrative, lifting the reader with *élan* through its 722 closely printed pages. Nevertheless, for those who are prepared to dig, there are plenty of fascinating insights into this important modern movement of the Holy Spirit.

I was myself for some years the Hon. Secretary of a Local Association in South India, but many facts in this book came home to me with all the novelty of the hitherto unrealized or unknown. I cite a few, by way of example.

The movement started as a spontaneous uprush of the Spirit occurring independently in several different parts of the world at one and the same time. It was highly "democratic" in origin, the leaders being drawn almost entirely from the ranks of quite low-salaried young wage-earners in various trades. Its driving force was a powerful sense of evangelistic mission, born of prayer and Bible study, towards all other young fellow-workers throughout the world.

Time after time the movement has been faced with disruption and disaster; but time after time it has been saved by its adherence to one short document, swiftly forged in the fire of enthusiasm at its first International Conference in Paris, in 1855. This astonishing little "Basis", assuredly of divine inspiration, can now be seen to hold in germ the principle of the whole ecumenical movement as it has subsequently developed. Whilst the word "ecumenical" has deepened in content in the last fifty years, it was the Y.M.C.A. which first re-coined it and returned it to circulation. Practically all the architects of the World's Student Christian Federation and the International Missionary Council were nurtured in the Y.M.C.A., so that the ancestry of even the World Council of Churches itself can be traced back to the little groups of shop assistants meeting with their Bibles in such places as Paris, London, and Geneva.

I think the book errs by concentrating on the domestic side of the movement, almost to the exclusion of relations with outside movements, organizations and institutions, many of them of first-rate importance in the lives of young men over the past century. For instance, I find no reference whatever to the trades union movement; nor to technical colleges in general and polytechnics in particular (of which the prototype is the Polytechnic Young Men's Christian Institute!); nor to that younger, smaller, more Anglo-Saxon, yet intensely virile, "sister" movement, Toc H, with which Y.M.C.A. worked hand-in-glove in this last war. Nor again is there any reference to practical steps in the field of Local Christian Co-operation and Social Responsibility—surely a most important opening for service before a Local Association to-day. The rapid growth of local Councils of Churches throughout the world invites the existence of the lively, youthful interdenominational Christian spearhead which can carry out the practical implementation of their various causes within the local community. Why is it that so often it is not the Local Association that is turned to for such help, but rather some *ad hoc* group of younger Church members, or some other local Christian body such as Toc H, if there happens to be one? This book provides me with no answer to such a question.

From my reading of this book, and my observation of the movement, my summing up of the present situation would be something like this. The world-wide Y.M.C.A. has been greatly used and blessed by God over the past century, but it now stands in a valley of decision. If it is to make its rightful contribution in the days to come, then members *in their Local Associations* will need to reinterpret to themselves the word "ecumenical" according to its 20th-century significance; and then start vigorous and practical action in an outward direction in the light of their new insight. This may very well involve the painful process of discarding established custom and vested interest; but we have the excellent promise that he who loses his life for Christ's sake and the Gospel's will save it, and I have a strong feeling that the movement has sufficient vitality to rise to the occasion.

Dunford, Midhurst. R. G. Bliss.

The Two Towers and The Return of the King. By J. R. R. Tolkien. Allen and Unwin. 21s. each.

These are the second and third volumes of the trilogy which began with *The Fellowship of the Ring*. Appreciations of them will continue to vary with the temperaments and insights of their readers. But surely the measure of an author's success is in his achievement of or failure to achieve what he set out to do. North and Hillard's Latin Prose Composition may fall short as a book of short stories—though many junior classics have found it diverting enough at the wrong times—but no judgment of it as such is likely to be just or valuable. Or again, if the reviewer simply said, "I don't like Latin Prose: therefore I think this is a bad book", he would not have done his job. But he might condemn it (*a*) if he did not think it taught Latin Prose well, or (*b*) if he thought that the learning of Latin was useless and out of date.

The potential reader of Professor Tolkien's trilogy should read reviews of it with three questions in mind: What has the author set out to do? Has he done it? Was it worth doing?

Some years ago Professor Tolkien wrote an article *On Fairy-Stories*. In this he speaks of true fantasy as the faculty of abstracting beauty from things, and using it for what he calls "sub-creation". So from the red of the sunrise, the morning note of the blackbird, the fresh feel of a spring frost and the tantalizing come and go of a March mist, the poet builds all kinds of fairy fabrics: and the fabrics are authentic, because the things themselves matter less than their contact with the mind of Man.

From a lifetime of study of Western ways of speech and story-telling, Professor Tolkien has abstracted this heroic cycle. Its authenticity is not to be judged by its faithfulness to Celtic legend —only the author knows how deep he dipped into that pool—but by a kind of archetypal validity more easily felt than described. He has been a "sub-creator" so effectively as to release the reader in the

Third Age of Middle Earth. This is what he set out to do, and he has done it. No review of this as an adventure story does it justice: indeed, as such it has the disadvantage of most epics; for its movement is unhurried; it travels at the speed of the age to which it belongs. This age rebels against the leisurely stride of past centuries: it has no patience with the delays and details of Dickens, nor the careful preliminaries of Scott. And yet this trilogy has an immense appeal (*experto crede*) to the age group which needs its imagination kept alive—and not only kept alive but directed along the right channels.

From fourteen onwards (we are sick of hearing it) the Church loses her children. They need something different, and yet not the idiom of the adult church-goer. When we find an idiom which appeals to the intelligent adolescent, for heaven's sake let us use it and keep their imaginations working in Christian channels, *without seeming to get at them*: otherwise it will be scientifiction, speed or sex. For here we have a redemption from a multiple fall into escapism (the elves), into hiding (the dwarves), into vegetable apathy (the ents), into the forbidden wisdom (men); and the redemption comes through the Hobbit, the New Creature called also the Halfling. The redemption is in the true Death-Resurrection pattern; and if the "free peoples", and often the narrative itself, make use of language which has been labelled "quasi-archaic" by those who disapprove, the Hobbits are always refreshingly "down-to-earth".

Here is a purpose, an achievement, and a relevance for to-day.

SOUTHBROOM. H. A. BLAIR.

MENSCHEN OHNE SCHLÜSSEL. By Lothar E. Herrwigh. Witten (Ruhr): Luther Verlag. N.p.

Hand in hand with full employment and innumerable scholarships, with health services and pensions, we have an increase of crime. It is a situation in which a prison chaplain should have something to say. He should have something to say particularly in Germany, where the end of the war confronted the inhabitants not only with heaps of rubble in the place of homes but also with the breakdown of administration and public supplies, and in countless instances with desperate poverty. There was the incitement to theft, fraud, and even violence, and there was the opportunity. The consequences are to be found in the prisons over there to-day.

In one of those prisons the author of this book was chaplain. "Lothar E. Herrwigh" is not his name. He is now the Lutheran pastor of a West German parish, and he has taken advantage of the change of cure to set down in writing his experiences, observation, and reflections in his former one. He does not pretend to be scientific, although he does quote some figures; instead he is thorough and he is frank. Nothing would be served in his being identifiable. He considers how men get into prison, the problem that results from the belief that guilt entails punishment, the opportunities of evil companionship both during detention and after release, the prison in-

mate's temptation to lose himself in a dream world and hence to be ill-fitted to face the real world when he returns to it, the sexual vices which prison life encourages, the fate of the political prisoner, prisoners and religion, the executioner and reprieve. He provides a list of prison slang. A former convict is even brought into his pages in order to express in writing his feelings about prison.

Incidentally, the former convict in question complains that a man serving sentence is not allowed a gradual return to decency but is regarded and treated when his sentence has almost expired as though he were still as guilty as upon the day he was convicted. He apparently thinks that there ought to be a scale, according to which the expiation of guilt would day by day bring back a little innocence, and that by the time he was set free an old lag might look as though he had been washed as white as the frock of the girl in the poster.

To return to the author: he mentions some cases of so-called "crimes against humanity", and he refers to a German soldier who was made a war criminal by the British on the ground that he had shot escaping prisoners of war. Congratulated by Hitler in a personal message in 1944, he was sentenced to death by the occupation forces in 1948. After the trial the author told the local British commandant that it would be murder to execute him, and tried to get the Archbishop of Canterbury, then in Germany, to intervene. The soldier was hanged. "But", adds Pastor "Herrwigh",

> The story had its sequel in the House of Lords. Through friends, the Bishop of Chichester, Dr Bell, was informed of what had taken place. No more death sentences were carried out. And a year after the execution the newspapers reported that revision proceedings would shortly begin.

In dealing with problems raised by the existence and detention of ordinary criminals, the pastor tends to be both ingenuous and sentimental. It remains uncertain whether he fancies he solves some of the problems which he propounds or whether he understands that they are beyond solution. But he writes as enticingly as a practised novelist.

It is Dr Hans Ehrenberg who has supplied the short introduction. He explains his fitness for the task by recalling that he has been locked up himself, not, however, as a criminal offender, he adds, but as a political one. He says that we in the outer world will never qualify to obtain a hearing from the inmates of a prison by adopting a moral stand; for the simple reason that they have consciences like ourselves. Samuel Butler favoured treating the sick as criminals. Dr Ehrenberg likens criminals to the sick. A criminal, he says, leads an existence differently constructed from ours. Condemnation and sentence have altered his life-status. He is henceforth on the margin, and nothing can ever again be the same. Dr Ehrenberg thinks that it will do none of us harm to try to understand the point of view of the man behind bars. Life, he says, requires to be seen from below; it requires to be seen from below even more than from above. Very likely he is right.

MONTGOMERY BELGION.

SHORTER NOTICES

KERYGMA UND DOGMA. I. Jahrgang, Heft 1/Januar 1956.

This is a new periodical, which, as its name suggests, is intended to provide a meeting-ground for biblical and systematic theologians. It is sponsored by a committee of Lutheran and Reformed theologians from Germany, Switzerland and Scandinavia, including Professors Peter Brunner, Oscar Cullmann, R. Prenter, G. von Rad and Edmund Schlink.

The first number includes a number of essays all concerned in one way or another with the copernican revolution in Protestant theology occasioned by the replacement of the propositional conception of revelation by that of personal encounter. This conception, having its roots in St Augustine, was revived by Luther, and after a temporary eclipse in Protestant orthodoxy, sprang to new life in Kierkegaard, and via Brunner and Bultmann has reached its most consistent expression in the writings of Gogarten. This view of revelation, which has a superficial appeal to many English-speaking theologians, has, when carried to its logical conclusions, far more profound and perhaps more devastating consequences than has as yet been realized on this side of the channel.

Book reviews will not normally be a feature of this periodical.

EVANSTON. R. H. FULLER.

THE ASCETIC AND THEOLOGICAL TEACHING OF GREGORY PALAMAS. By Fr Basil Krivosheine. Geo. E. J. Coldwell. 5s.

This is the reprint of an article hitherto available to English readers in the pages of *The Eastern Churches Quarterly*.

It is not given to us to know God in himself; we know him prayerfully in his presence and in his grace; and this is truly to meet God. This statement might serve to sum up what is argued in terms of theological analysis and construction in Fr Krivosheine's neat and lucid essay. The reader is conducted through St Gregory's teaching concerning the internal prayer of integral man and the revelation of the hidden God in his energies and comes to rest in a study of the Transfiguration.

St Gregory Palamas has been a thorn in the theological flesh of Dr Mascall for at least ten years (from *He Who Is* in 1943 to *Corpus Christi* in 1953); and in his notes to this reprint Dom Bede Winslow shows a disciplined caution in recommending anything so antinomic. We seem to meet the distinction drawn also by Fr Krivosheine between the cataphatic theology peculiar to the Catholic West and the apophatic theology which prevails in the Orthodox East. Empirically it is so; and here is a nice sample for the tasting. It is less easy to see on what basis we might make our choice between the two,

or how the expression of theological truth can fail to be both apophatic and cataphatic. The differences of possible emphasis can only point to the preparation between the Nay and the Yea as demanding attention.

Meanwhile it would seem to be the high power of the tension between the Nay and the Yea that enables St Gregory to defend the doctrine of the Uncreated Light with the vigour of modern paradox.

A. F. Dobbie-Bateman.

Frome.

Services and Prayers for Country Use. Compiled by Paul A. Welsby. Longmans. 4s.

This little paper-covered book is cheap and nicely produced for these times. It contains all the material needed for Plough Sunday, Rogation, Lammastide and Harvest. There are also services for the blessing of a farmhouse, a market, an animal service (not *too* bad) and seasonal forms for children. We are glad to have the Canticle of St Francis, but most of us have Psalm 104 and the *Benedicite omnia opera* in our Prayer Books. An appendix contains Watchnight and memorial services, and one for the commemoration of benefactors, together with intercession, anointing and laying-on of hands for the sick. This book will be found useful in the city as well as in the country. It follows the central traditional line of the Via Media, and deserves to be widely used. When constant use has separated the precious from the vile (if indeed there is anything vile in it), some parts of it might serve as an appendix to the Book of Common Prayer—and a reviewer can hardly say more than that in praise of a compiler, or of his creditors.

Cosslett Quin.

Cork.

After this Manner: Devotions from the Holy Bible and the Book of Common Prayer after the Manner of the Lord's Prayer. Vol. 2. Compiled by an Honorary Fellow of Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

This is a reprint of Parts IV (Oblation) and V (Communion) of a series published originally by the Oxford Mission to Calcutta under the title *Our Father*. Many people will be delighted that it is now more easily available. The author modestly describes herself as a "compiler", but this is far more than a compilation. In Part IV the great themes of the Bible are drawn upon to weave magnificent meditations and prayers, mainly Eucharistic in their direction, which make up a storehouse to which one can return again and again. Part V is particularly enriched by an illuminating selection of Eastern prayers arranged for use before, during and after the Communion. The remaining volumes will be eagerly awaited.

Delhi. J. D. M. Stuart.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

BLACKFRIARS: Humbert of Romans, *A Treatise on Preaching* (12s. 6d.).

BURNS AND OATES: M B. Salu, *The Ancrene Riwle* (15s.).

CAREY KINGSGATE PRESS: J. D. Hughey, Jr., *Religious Freedom in Spain* (15s.).

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY: J. Sandegren, Bishop of Tranquebar, *The Song of Tranquebar* (12 annas).

DESCLÉ ET CIE: T. Chary, *Les Prophètes et le Culte à partir de l'Exil* (150 Belgian francs).

EDINBURGH HOUSE PRESS AND MACMILLAN: Ernest A. Payne, *The Growth of the World Church* (6s. 6d.).

EDITIONS DU SEUIL: Henri Marrou, *Saint Augustin* (n.p.); M. D. Chenu, *Pour une Théologie du Travail* (Fr. 330).

EPWORTH PRESS: G Leslie Mitton, *The Formation of the Pauline Corpus of Letters* (8s. 6d.); James Hope Moulton, *An Introduction to the Study of New Testament Greek with a First Reader* [new edition] (10s. 6d.).

FABER AND FABER: E. W. F. Tomlin, *Living and Knowing* (25s.).

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: J. C. Pollock, *The Cambridge Seven* (3s. 6d.; in cloth boards, 6s.).

LONGMANS: C. C. Martindale, S.J , *The Gospel According to Saint Mark* [Stoneyhurst Scripture Manuals] (7s. 6d.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: Emil G. Kraeling, *The Old Testament since the Reformation* (27s. 6d.); Giovanni Miegge, *The Virgin Mary* (21s.); J. Windrow Sweetman, *Islam and Christian Theology*. Part II. Vol. I. (31s. 6d.).

MOWBRAY: Margaret Sawtell, *Christina Rossetti* (10s. 6d.); J. W. C. Wand, *The Four Great Heresies* (8s. 6d.); F. A. Cockin, Bishop of Bristol, *Faith and Work* ["Sermons of To-day Series"] (8s. 6d.).

NELSON: J. W. D. Smith, *The Pattern of Christian Belief* (12s. 6d.).

NISBET: Arthur F. Smethurst, *Modern Science and Christian Belief* (21s.).

PATERNOSTER PRESS: J. Stafford Wright, *What is Man?* (10s. 6d).

PAYN ESSEX AND SON (SUDBURY): C. A. L. Brownlow, *61 Problems* (3s.).

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF ENGLAND (134 GEORGE STREET, LONDON, W.1): J. M. Ross, *What is an Elder?* [revised edition] (9d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Hugh Martin, *The Claims of Christ* (7s.); John Bunyan, *Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners* (8s. 6d.); Wilhelm Andersen, *Towards a Theology of Mission* (3s.); M A. C. Warren, *Caesar the Beloved Enemy* (4s.); Heinz-Horst Schrey, Hans Hermann Walz, W. A. Whitehouse, *The Biblical Doctrine of Justice and Law* (8s. 6d.); Antony Flew and Alasdair MacIntyre, *New Essays in Philosophical Theology* (21s.); J. Spencer Trimingham, *The Christian Church and Islam in West Africa* (3s.); James Brown, *Subject and Object in Modern Theology* (18s.).

SCRIBNER'S: Philip H. Ashby, *The Conflict of Religions* ($3.50).

SEMINARIO CONCILIAR DE BARCELONA: P. T. Ros, *El Trabajo según la Biblia* (n.p.).

SHEED AND WARD: Etienne Gilson, *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (42s).

S.P.C.K.: Adolf Schlatter, *The Church in the New Testament Period* (21s.); Jessie E. Higson, *The Story of a Beginning* (15s.; in paper covers, 7s. 6d.); G. Lacey May (Ed.), *Wings of an Eagle* (10s. 6d.); T. R. Teague, *A Memoir of William Edmund Smyth* (5s.); George Ogg, *The Pseudo-Cyprianic de Pascha Computus* (6s. 6d.); Caroline M. Duncan-Jones, *Miss Mitford and Mr Harness* (12s 6d.); F. C. Blomfield, *Wonderful Order* (2s. 6d.).

TYNDALE PRESS: Leon Morris, *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross* (15s.).

WORLD DOMINION PRESS: Donald Anderson McGavran, *The Bridges of God* (7s. 6d.).

The Protestant Tradition

J. S. WHALE

'The Protestant tradition is powerfully alive in the mid-twentieth century and anyone who imagines it is on the wane had better read Dr. Whale's book.' CECIL NORTHCOTT in the OBSERVER.

'It should be made compulsory reading for all ordinands, lay preachers and church officials; and no intelligent layman should think his education complete until he has studied it well.' JOHN MARSH in the CHRISTIAN.

'Vigorously commended to the most energetic study of every Protestant in the least concerned to be worth his salt.' THE SCOTSMAN.

'This book will delight and profit many parsons, students, and thoughtful laymen, and will usefully remind them all of the heights and depths and riches of the Protestant tradition.' GORDON RUPP in the METHODIST RECORDER.

21*s. net*

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

HEFFER'S of CAMBRIDGE

Booksellers

BRITISH AND AMERICAN
EUROPEAN AND ORIENTAL
NEW AND SECONDHAND

Large and small collections bought

W. HEFFER AND SONS LIMITED
PETTY CURY · CAMBRIDGE

Wings of an Eagle

G. Lacey May — **10s 6d net**

Sixty extracts from the works of the great Caroline preachers, with an introductory chapter on Caroline preaching.

The Story of a Beginning

J. E. Higson — **Cloth 15s net; Paper 7s 6d net**

Miss Higson has been engaged in Moral Welfare almost from its inception. Her story is its story. She shows how from small beginnings great things have grown.

Christ in the Concrete City

3s 6d net

A Passion Play, published for the *Religious Drama Society*, which sets out dramatically the meaning of the Passion in words and images understandable by the ordinary people of a modern industrial city.

S·P·C·K

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LTD.
GUILDFORD AND LONDON